DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 550 UD 024 956

TITLE	The New York City Staff Development Program for Bilingual Early Childhood Teachers 1984-1985. OEA Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn. Office of Educational Assessment.
PUB DATE	86
NOTE	34p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Office of Educational Assessment, New York City Board of Education, 110 Livingston St., Brooklyn, NY 11201.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; *Bilingual Teachers; Early Childhood Education; English (Second Language); *Inservice Education; Limited English Speaking; Staff Development; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	New York (Brooklyn)

ABSTRACT

This Staff Development Program is the first attempt to provide thematic, in-service workshops to large numbers of early childhood bilingual teachers throughout New York City. The main themes were: curricula, reading readiness and reading instruction, second language instruction through content areas, and instructional skills and strategies for teaching limited English proficient (LEP) students. Using quantitative and qualitative data, this document describes and evaluates the planning and implementation of the training sessions, and assesses the program's effectiveness in accomplishing its objectives. Participant satisfaction ratings were somewhat positively related to self-ratings of Spanish and English proficiency and, to a lesser extent, educational background. Participants were enthusiastic about the organization and administration of the training, the high quality of the presenters, and the links made between theoretical information and practical application. Recommendations include: (1) a follow-up survey questionnaire to see if training resulted in classroom implementation of strategies; (2) continued assessment of the needs of bilingual, English as a second language, and specialized content area teachers, administrators and counselors working with LEP children; (3) tighter screening to ensure qualified participants only; (4) increasing interaction between presenters and participants; and (5) elimination of the proposed achievement objective. (ETS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T.K. Minter

NYC Board of Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE NEW YORK CITY STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR BILINGUAL EARLY CHILDHOOD TEACHERS 1984-1985

OEA Evaluation Report

O.E.A. Evaluation Section Report
Robert Tobias, Administrator of Evaluation
Judith S. Torres, Senior Manager
Project Number: 42-68402

THE NEW YORK CITY STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR BILINGUAL EARLY CHILDHOOD TEACHERS 1984-1985

PROGRAM CO-COORDINATORS:
ANGELA BAZLEY
MILDRED GONZALEZ

Prepared by the
Bilingual Education Evaluation Unit
Armando Cotayo, Evaluation Manager
Jose J. Villegas, Evaluation/Planning Specialist
Shelley M. Fischer, Evaluation/Planning Specialist
Barbara Sjostrom, Evaluation Consultant

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Assessment
Richard Guttenberg, Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	OVERVIEW	1
II.	PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS	5
III.	FINDINGS	9
	ATTENDANCE	9
	SATISFACTION	10
	ACHIEVEMENT	13
IV.	RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN FINDINGS AND PARTICIPANTS' BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS	15
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	22

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
TABLE 1:	Participants' Educational Backgrounds: Areas of Concentration.	5
TABLE 2:	Number and Percent of Program Participants by Country of Birth.	8
TABLE 3:	Participants' Average Satisfaction Ratings on Each Dimension for all Sessions.	11
TABLE 4:	Average Satisfaction Ratings for Each Dimension, by Session.	12
TABLE 5:	Performance by Years of Experience as a K-2 Teacher and a K-2 Spanish/English Bilingual Teacher.	20
TABLE 6:	Means, Standard Deviations, and F-Values of Type of License/Certification Found to be Related to Participant Achievement.	21

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT

The New York City Staff Development Program for Bilingual Early Childhood Teachers, funded by the Bureau of Bilingual Education of the New York State Education Department, was designed to serve teachers of grades K-2 who have up to four years of teaching experience, and who are currently working with limited English proficient (LEP) students.

The major objective of the program was to provide an overview of issues pertinent to the instruction of LEP students in early childhood classes. The main themes were: early childhood curricula, reading readiness and reading instruction, second language instruction through the content areas, and instructional skills and strategies for teaching LEP students.

The director of the Office of Bilingual Education supervised the program, and the deputy director and executive assistant of that office were responsible for coordination. Six supervisors, six consultants, and eight administrative staff members also worked directly with the program. All planning and implementation of activities was coordinated with the Divisions of Budget, Personnel, and Early Childhood of the Board of Education.

The program served 430 teachers (of whom 325 filled out program evaluation forms) from the 32 community school districts in New York City in a series of four, half-day training sessions conducted on two Saturdays each in March and April. Each session included a general meeting and approximately 14 concurrent workshops that addressed the day's topic.

Of the participants, 115 (35 percent) were born in the United States, 107 (33 percent) were born in Puerto Rico, and the rest were primarily from Central and South America. They included 176 (61 percent) persons with master's (M.A.) degrees and 32 (11 percent) with degrees beyond an M.A. Only 81 (26 percent) had not yet completed an M.A. degree. For the baccalaureate (B.A.) degree, most participants had majored or minored in elementary education, bilingual education, Spanish, or early childhood education.

Those who earned graduate degrees generally specialized in early childhood education, elementary education, or bilingual education. The majority were licensed or certified in Common Branches, Bilingual Common Branches, and English as a Second Language (E.S.L.). Participants reported having taught in grades K-2 an average of four years, and were currently assigned as bilingual (73 percent) or E.S.L. (18 percent) teachers.

The evaluation for 1984-1985 focused on a description of the planning and implementation of the training sessions as well as an assessment of the program's effectiveness in accomplishing its objectives as proposed to and approved by the State Education Department. Data were collected through teacher background questionnaires, evaluation forms, interviews, and on-site observations of training activities. An evaluation of the data indicated that the program was highly successful in achieving its objectives.

Over 94 percent (403) of the participants attended the sessions held in March and 95 percent (409) attended the sessions held in April.

The participants rated the workshops on clarity, organization, knowledge, scope, usefulness, and "overall". The 52 percent who rated all sessions indicated a high degree of satisfaction. Using a four-point scale, 98 to 100 percent of the participants rated all workshops greater than 3.6 along each dimension.

Participants were also asked to provide three specific strategies learned. Seventeen percent gave three strategies and 46 percent provided two. The strategies were generally rated by the evaluation team as either somewhat specific (66 percent) or general answers (24 percent).

Participants who rated themselves highly proficient in Spanish tended to be highly satisfied, whereas those who rated themselves highly proficient in English, tended to be less satisfied. Participants who had a master's degree or higher tended to be more satisfied than participants with lower degrees.

Licensed E.S.L. participants were able to provide more specific strategies than those not licensed in E.S.L. The number and quality of strategies that participants provided were not related to any other background characteristics, nor to the participants' expressed satisfaction.

However, the relationship to teaching experience was not consistent and the relationship to E.S.L. license or certification may only indicate that much of what was covered was already learned by E.S.L. teachers in courses required for their certification.

Major strengths of the training sessions expressed by participants and observed by the evaluation team were the overall organization and administration of training; the extent to which presenters were enthusiastic, well-prepared, and knowledgeable in the subject matter; the link that was made in most workshops between the theoretical information

presented at the general sessions and its practical application in a classroom setting; the appropriateness and abundance of materials provided in the workshops; and the actual demonstration of instructional strategies. The only participants' concern was that the sessions were not long enough to allow them to interact sufficiently with the presenters.

The following recommendations are aimed at enhancing the future efficacy of the New York City Staff Development Program for Bilingual Early Childhood Teachers for the improvement of similar activities in the future:

1. A follow-up survey questionnaire should be developed, administered, and analyzed to see whether the training resulted in actual implementation of strategies in the classroom. Such a survey would provide baseline data for planning similar future activities. This may be accomplished through a one-day follow-up session for all participants to discuss their progress in implementing the strategies gained from the training.

2. The Office of Bilingual Education should continue to assess the needs of bilingual, E.S.L., and specialized content area (e.g., science) teachers as well as administrators and counselors who work with L.E.P. children. O.B.E. should continue to offer staff development of this nature on different issues and at different grade levels. This would validate the findings of the present study regarding the relationship among background characteristics, satisfaction, and achievement with a different group of teachers.

3. Program staff should tighten the screening process to make sure that districts send only participants who meet the criterion of no more than four years of experience.

4. Program staff should study the ways to lengthen future workshop sessions or provide another forum so there can be greater interaction between presenters and participants.

5. Since the development of a criterion-referenced instrument based on the objectives of the workshop may not be feasible, the project should eliminate the proposed achievement objective.

NEW YORK CITY STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR BILINGUAL EARLY CHILDHOOD TEACHERS

PROGRAM LOCATION:	Office of Bilingual Education 131 Livingston Street Brooklyn, New York 11201
YEAR OF OPERATION:	1984-1985, first year
TARGET POPULATION:	430 bilingual early childhood education teachers (Kindergarten through Grade Two)
PROGRAM DIRECTOR:	Angela Bazley

I. OVERVIEW

The New York City Staff Development Program for Bilingual Early Childhood Teachers is the first attempt to provide thematic, in-service training to large numbers of bilingual teachers citywide. This unique project was designed for bilingual teachers with up to four years of experience, many of whom were new to the early childhood grades.

The Staff Development Program was funded by the Bureau of Bilingual Education of the New York State Education Department (N.Y.S.E.D.). It served 430 bilingual teachers working with approximately 13,000 limited English proficient (LEP) students in the New York City Public School System.

Building on staff experience and expertise in the New York City Board of Education's Office of Bilingual Education (O.B.E.), this centrally based project had as its primary goal the provision of in-service training in four areas:

early childhood curricula and instruction in a bilingual setting, reading readiness and processes for teaching reading, second language instruction through content areas, and overall skills and strategies for teaching LEP students.

According to the project director, the initial impetus for the program came as a result of site visits to various school districts by the director of O.B.E. who saw a need for this kind of specialized training. O.B.E. received funding from the N.Y.S.E.D.'s Bureau of Bilingual Education.

The director of O.B.E. oversaw the program, while O.B.E.'s deputy director and executive assistant coordinated it: they hired presenters and workshop consultants, recruited and selected participants, and decided on content and format for the sessions. The four central in-service topics were selected in consultation with various educators and agencies in the N.Y.S.E.D. and the New York City Board of Education. Information on the target population, the objectives, and the scope of the program was distributed to all 32 New York City community school districts through circulars, letters, and application forms that gave details of pre-registration procedures, dates, times, and topics. Applications required the approval and signatures of principals and district superintendents. The school districts nominated 672 potential participants, of whom O.B.E. selected 430. The basic criterion for selection was teachers' years of experience in bilingual early childhood

classrooms, with first priority given to those with the least experience. However, many participants had several years' experience teaching these grades. Of the 213 participants who reported the number of years' experience teaching early childhood grades, 66 percent (141) had four years or less experience; 34 percent (72) had experience ranging from five to 20 years. Training was given in four Saturday morning sessions (8:30 to noon) on March 23 and 30, and April 20 and 27. The four sessions had similar formats: registration, opening remarks, a 90-minute general meeting, a period for filling out forms, and a selection of 50-minute workshops (an average of 14 each session). The workshops covered the four central in-service topics: curricula, reading readiness/reading processes, second language instruction through content areas, and skills and strategies for instructing LEP students.

The four keynote speakers at the general meetings were an elementary school principal, a faculty member from Fordham University, a staff member from Teachers College, and a faculty member from Hunter College. Each speaker had training in bilingual and early childhood education, and each presented a general theoretical perspective.

Field practitioners, representing various language groups and areas of expertise, conducted the workshops which were designed to expand and apply the information presented in the general meetings. According to the program director,

two meetings were held with workshop leaders prior to the training sessions to discuss project goals and to determine the leaders' grade level preferences, special areas of expertise, and other basic information. In addition, the format and content of the four training sessions were discussed to ensure the link between theory and practice in all sessions. Thus the program emphasized the "how to" as well as the "what" of more effectively instructing LEP students, so that participants could leave the sessions feeling they had accomplished something concrete.

This evaluation report is based on quantitative and qualitative data, and examines the extent to which the program met its objectives as outlined in the funding proposal to N.Y.S.E.D. Data-collection included:

- a teacher background questionnaire filled out by 325 participants;
- evaluation forms for specified activities developed by the Office of Educational Assessment;
- on-site observation of the four general sessions and ten workshops;
- formal interviews with the program director that focused on planning, implementation, and effectiveness of the program; and
- informal interviews with program participants to discuss their feelings about the workshops' effectiveness.

II. PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

Program participants represented all the New York City community school districts (C.S.D.s). Of the 325 participants who filled out the background questionnaire C.S.D. 6 had 40 participants; C.S.D.s 7 and 32 had 25 participants each; and C.S.D. 9 had 20 participants. All other districts had fewer than 20 participants.

In terms of education, 176 (61 percent) had at least a master's degree, and 32 (11 percent) had earned post-master's degrees. Only 81 (26 percent) had less than a master's degree. While earning their bachelor's degrees, 264 participants (82 percent) majored or minored in one of the following areas:

TABLE 1

Participants' Educational Backgrounds: Areas of Concentration

Area	Major		Minor	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
Elementary Education	81	(25%)	86	(25%)
Bilingual Education	46	(14%)	15	(5%)
Spanish	58	(18%)	41	(13%)
Early Childhood	21	(7%)	5	(2%)
Content Areas	58	(18%)	62	(21%)
All Other Areas	51	(18%)	116	(34%)

The teachers were diverse in national origin, educational background, and teaching experience. One hundred

fifteen teachers (35 percent) were born in the United States and 107 (33 percent) were born in Puerto Rico. Of the remaining participants, the majority were born in Latin countries in Central and South America. Table 2 presents the distribution of participants' countries of birth.

Of the participants who had a master's degree, 180 (73 percent) specialized in the following areas: 108 in bilingual education (44 percent); 27 in early childhood education (11 percent); 25 in E.S.L. (10 percent); and 20 in elementary education (eight percent). Most participants, regardless of degree, were licensed or certified in the following areas: 173 in Common Branches (54 percent), 74 in Bilingual Common Branches (23 percent); and 31 in E.S.L.(10 percent). Of the 31 participants who were licensed in E.S.L., 16 were also licensed in Common Branches and 13 were licensed in Bilingual Common Branches (10 in Spanish, three in French, and one in some "other" foreign language). Clearly, the training these participants had received was not only advanced, but also specialized.

At the time of the training sessions, 237 (73 percent) were assigned as bilingual teachers and 58 (18 percent) were E.S.L. teachers. They had been working with early childhood grades for an average of four years. Ninety-nine teachers (31 percent) had experience as both E.S.L. and bilingual teachers for early childhood. Of the bilingual teachers, 156 (48 percent) reported having experience teaching early

childhood grades. Those who reported themselves as being bilingual teachers taught in Spanish and English.

Data regarding the current status/position of those participating in the program were available for 316 teachers. At the time of the program, 162 (50 percent) were tenured, 59 (19 percent) were regular substitutes, 48 (15 percent) were probationary, and 47 (15 percent) were per diem substitutes.

Finally, 113 teachers (35 percent) reported that they had been former educational assistants. Half of these reported having five or more years of experience in this position.

TABLE 2

Number and Percent of Program Participants
by Country of Birth

COUNTRY OF BIRTH	NUMBER	PERCENT
U.S.A.	115	35
Puerto Rico	107	33
Cuba	20	6
Dominican Republic	13	4
Panama	7	2
Haiti	6	2
Ecuador	6	2
Paraguay	5	2
Costa Rica	3	1
Peru	3	1
Honduras	2	1
Bolivia	2	1
Brazil	2	1
Mexico	1	*
El Salvador	1	*
Colombia	1	*
Chile	1	*
Uruguay	1	*
Venezuela	1	*
Argentina	1	*
Central and S. America	1	*
Spain	1	*
Portugal	1	*
Italy	1	*
Poland	1	*

*
Less than one percent

- Most participants were born in the United States and Puerto Rico.

III. FINDINGS

The program implemented all its proposed activities on schedule, with no major modifications in either the content or the format of the four general sessions. Only a few minor changes were necessary in the order of topics covered, but none were made in the selection of speakers or topics or in the basic scope of activities proposed. The most difficult problem, as identified by the program director and corroborated by evaluators' observations, was allowing sufficient time for the workshops. Having all 14 presenters prepared and on hand at the same time also took some effort. In addition, processing per diem stipends for the 430 teachers and obtaining completed teacher questionnaires and evaluation forms required meticulous management on the part of O.B.E.'s staff.

The following sections present the assessment instruments, procedures, and results for the Staff Development Program for Bilingual Early Childhood Teachers (K-2) by objective.

ATTENDANCE

> "Eighty percent of the bilingual/E.S.L. early childhood teachers registered in the program will attend each of the four sessions proposed."

The training program consisted of four one-day sessions. Each session offered two types of presentations: one general presentation in the morning and a choice of 14 specific workshops in the afternoon.

According to the attendance records maintained by O.B.E., 94 percent (403) of those registered for the program attended the sessions held in March and 95 percent (409) attended the sessions held in April. The program objective of 80 percent attendance was thus met.

SATISFACTION

> "Ninety percent of the participants will be highly satisfied (an average rating of three or above on a five-point Likert scale) with the clarity, scope, thoroughness, and usefulness of the training sessions."

The form used to evaluate the program asked participants to rate the clarity, organization, knowledge, scope, and usefulness of the presentations, and to provide an overall assessment of the training sessions on a four-point Likert Scale (1=lowest; 4=highest). The four-point scale was used to prevent participants from using the non-committed midpoint response on a five point scale. Despite the more restricted range (see Table 3), the mean rating for each dimension for all general and workshop presentations combined was an average of 3.6 or higher, indicating that virtually all participants were highly pleased with the program. Indeed, this objective was achieved and surpassed.

Table 4 presents mean satisfaction ratings for each day. Overall, satisfaction ratings were very high, ranging from 3.6 to 3.8. The degree of agreement among participants and the consistency of high satisfaction ratings across dimensions suggest that teachers were highly satisfied with the Staff Development Program.

TABLE 3

Participants' Average Satisfaction* Ratings on Each Dimension for All Sessions

Dimension	Number of Respondents	%	Average Rating**
Clarity of Purpose	158	100	3.7 (.52)
Organization of Materials	159	99	3.7 (.57)
Knowledge of Speaker	160	100	3.8 (.45)
Scope of Presentation	158	100	3.8 (.62)
Usefulness of Presentation	151	99	3.6 (.63)
Overall Assessment	154	98	3.6 (.58)

Note: Satisfaction ratings were based on persons who attended all eight workshops.

* Rating Scale: Range = 1 to 4; 1=Lowest, 4=Highest.

* Numbers in parentheses represent standard deviations.

- Satisfaction ratings for all presentations throughout the program met and surpassed the objective.

Overall, participants were extremely satisfied with each of the general presentations and specific workshops offered. In fact, several specific workshops received a mean rating of "4" on all dimensions by all participants.

Program participants were also asked to list what they perceived as the primary strengths of the general meetings and workshops. Their answers indicated that these strengths fell into three main categories: presenters' skills, content

TABLE 4

Average Satisfaction Ratings* For Each Dimension, By Session

	DIMENSION					
Session	Clarity	Organiza-tion	Knowledge	Scope	Useful-ness	Overall Rating
Day 1	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.7	3.7
Day 2	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6
Day 3	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7
Day 4	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.6

* Range = 1 to 4; 1 = lowest, 4 = highest

- The objective regarding participant satisfaction was achieved and surpassed when data were analyzed on a daily basis.

of the presentations, and materials. Other areas of strength identified by the participants were the kinds of materials provided (e.g., hand-outs, bibliographies, outlines) as well as the actual content of the presentations.

In ten workshops observed, the participants constantly referred to the content of the general meeting and how to translate it into hands-on activities: teaching science through content instruction by relating children's cognitive styles to instruction for LEP children; teaching language in the same way as teaching content and building on the child's background knowledge; teaching E.S.L. using content areas with specific record-keeping and lesson-planning techniques to assess LEP students' progress; teaching mathematics in Haitian Creole using concepts based on

activities known to children (e.g., sports); classroom management techniques for learning in a multicultural world; using meticulous scheduling in all the content areas, including music; integration of curricula to reinforce language skills in kindergarten LEP students by making puppets; and ideas for working with gifted LEP students. The observation team's perceptions in this area were consistent with those of the participants.

Clearly then, based on participants' evaluations of the presentations, the Staff Development Program was successful in achieving the proposed objectives.

ACHIEVEMENT

> "As a result of this training program, participants will demonstrate a statistically significant ($p<.05$) increase in knowledge of language development, curriculum development and adaptation, and teaching methods."

This proposed objective was based on the assumption that criterion-referenced tests would be administered on a pretest and posttest basis to measure participants' achievement. Since no criterion-referenced test was available, the N.Y.S.E.D. agreed on an alternate measure of achievement.

After each general presentation and specific workshop, participants were asked to list three specific strategies they had learned to teach LEP students in early childhood classes. However, no criterion was set as to what proportion of participants should provide three (or two or one) strategies to determine achievement of the objective.

Nevertheless, the number of strategies listed by each

participant were counted. Results indicated that 17 percent of the teachers listed three new strategies learned per presentation; 46 percent listed two new strategies; 66 percent listed one new strategy. Twenty percent failed to answer the question about specific strategies indicating that some participants may have felt that the strategies were not new to them, or may not have had time to assimilate the information and decide how it could be applied to the classroom.

Because specific strategies were requested, the evaluation team also rated the degree of specificity of the strategies provided using the following scale:

0 = irrelevant or unintelligible answer, or respondent learned "nothing"
1 = general answer
2 = somewhat specific (unexplained technique/method)
3 = specific (explanation of technique/method)
4 = very specific (detailed explanation)

Responses assigned high values (e.g., "4") were considered "high achievement"; those assigned a low value (e.g., "0") reflected low achievement.

Of those strategies listed, 16 percent were rated as "somewhat specific", and 24 percent were rated as a "general answer." Very few participants responded with strategies that were judged to be "specific" (six percent), "irrelevant" (four percent) or "very specific" (less than one percent).

IV. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FINDINGS AND PARTICIPANTS' BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

SATISFACTION RATINGS AND BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

An additional program goal was to determine if satisfaction ratings were influenced by participants' backgrounds. Correlations were computed to assess the relationship between each satisfaction dimension and the following background variables: highest degree earned, area of specialization, number of graduate education credits earned; participants' age, proficiency ratings in English and Spanish, type of license/certification, years of teaching experience, teacher assignment (e.g. E.S.L., bilingual) for grades K-12, current position held, language background, and place of education. On the whole, participants' backgrounds were not found to be strongly related to their satisfaction ratings. Among all the variables, the only relationships that emerged as statistically significant were for highest degree earned and proficiency ratings in English and Spanish.

To perform the analysis, participants with a bachelor's degree (N=69) and those with at least a master's degree (N=177) were grouped separately. The results indicated a small but statistically significant positive correlation between the teachers' satisfaction rating of "clarity" and highest degree earned (r=.20), suggesting that participants with higher education (i.e. master's degree and beyond) rated the purpose of the workshops as clearer than those who held a bachelor's degree.

However, since the correlation was small and there were many more participants with master's degrees than with bachelor's degrees, caution must be exercised in assigning too much weight to this relationship.

The only other characteristics that appeared to be related to participant satisfaction were proficiency ratings in Spanish and English. In general, those who rated themselves as highly proficient in Spanish tended to be more satisfied with the presentations than those who rated themselves less proficient in Spanish. Specifically, participants who rated themselves highly proficient in Spanish were more inclined to report: (1) the purpose of the workshop as quite clear ($r=.21$); (2) the content of the presentations as very useful ($r=.21$); and (3) their overall assessment of the sessions as high ($r=.27$). Conversely, as self-ratings in English proficiency increased, ratings of the presentation's scope decreased ($r=-.17$, $p<.01$).

Not all satisfaction dimensions were significantly correlated with proficiency ratings, and those correlations that were statistically significant were rather weak. However, there was little variability among ratings because most participants agreed that the presenters and the presentations were very good, and there was little variability among proficiency ratings. This is likely to limit the potential magnitude of the correlations. Therefore, there does appear to be some relationship between

how the teachers evaluated themselves on language proficiency and how they evaluated the workshops.

ACHIEVEMENT AND BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

In order to examine the relationship between achievement and participants' characteristics, it was necessary to consider how to combine both the number (quantity) of strategies listed and their degree of specificity (quality). The original rating scale was revised so that each successive rating might be considered twice as good as the previous one. For example, a somewhat specific response would be considered twice as good as a general response. This scale weights the total number of responses a participant provides in such a way that two somewhat specific answers are scored higher (eight) than three general answers (six).

	Original Scale	Revised Scale
Irrelevant answer-respondent learned nothing	0	1
General answer	1	2
Somewhat specific	2	4
Specific	3	8
Very specific	4	16

Using the revised rating scale, frequencies, correlations, and analyses of variance were computed to determine if participants' backgrounds influenced achievement. The measure of achievement was the sum of all

revised ratings divided by 24 (the maximum number of strategies participants were asked to list).

The variables included the highest degree completed, area of specialization in college, number of graduate credits earned, participants' age, proficiency ratings in English and Spanish, type of license and certification, years of teaching experience across all grades, current position held, language background credits earned, and whether they were educated in or outside the United States.

The results of analyses of variance indicate that the total number of years teaching early childhood in general ($F [16,196]=2.01$; $p<.01$), and the total number of years as a Spanish/English bilingual teacher for early childhood, ($F [15,187]=1.96$; $p<.02$), were related to the quality and quantity of participants' achievement. Means and standard deviations of the strategies listed for these teachers, broken down by years of experience, are presented in Table 5.

As the table indicates, the pattern of achievement by number of years' teaching early childhood is not consistent: those with two, four, and seven years' experience reported they learned fewer strategies than those with one, three, five, and six years' experience. Similarly, for bilingual (Spanish) early childhood teachers, those with two, four, and seven years' experience did not learn as much as those with one, three, and five years' experience. Therefore, while the relationships are significant, the lack of consistency does not allow generalizations.

The only other background variable significantly related to achievement was license/certification in E.S.L. on the elementary school level ($p<.02$). The data indicate that participants whose license or certification was in E.S.L. (elementary) had a higher mean score on the scale combining quantity and quality of answers. This may indicate that much of the material covered was already learned by E.S.L. teachers in the courses required for E.S.L. certification. Means, standard deviations, and F-values of those who are licensed and certified are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 5

Performance by Years of Experience as a K-2 Teacher and a K-2 Spanish/English Bilingual Teacher

Years' Experience as a K-2 Teacher	Number of Participants	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	30	2.25	.86
2	44	1.60	.79
3	30	2.07	.65
4	34	1.75	1.03
5	22	2.28	.98
6	12	2.08	1.12
7	12	1.78	.78
Years' Experience as a K-2 Spanish/English Bilingual Teacher			
1	40	2.19	.81
2	49	1.65	.70
3	27	2.12	.71
4	22	1.78	1.02
5	18	2.00	1.07
6	11	2.04	1.29
7	13	1.66	.85

* Rating Scale: Range 1 to 16; 1=irrelevant answer or respondent learned nothing, 2=general answer, 4=somewhat specific, 8=specific, 16=very specific.

o The relationship between teaching experience and achievement is not linear, making it difficult to evaluate how "experience" influenced "achievement".

TABLE 6

Means, Standard Deviations, and F-Values of Type of License/Certification Found to be Related to Participant Achievement

Variable	Number of Participants	Average Rating for the Number and Quality of Strategies Learned in Each Presentation*	F-Value	Level of Sign.
E.S.L. License (Elementary)	31	2.4 (.66)	7.13	p<.001
No E.S.L. (Elem) License	294	1.9 (.92)	-----	
E.S.L. Certificate	14	2.5 (.96)	5.11	p<.02
No E.S.L. (Elem) Certificate	311	1.9 (.90)	------	-------

*Numbers in parentheses represent standard deviations.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The New York City Staff Development Program for Bilingual Early Childhood Teachers, in its first series of citywide training sessions for teachers working with LEP students, was successful. The program staff's systematic planning and organizational skills were evident throughout the four training sessions in such matters as smooth transition between activities and well-run registrations for the large number of participants. Furthermore, the schedule was closely followed throughout.

The speakers, workshop leaders, and participants were highly motivated. Thus, positive interaction was fostered in all activities. The content and structure of the staff development activities were consistent with the outlined objectives and were well received by participants.

When participants were asked to make recommendations for future sessions, many suggested that more time be provided for workshop speakers and for question-and-answer periods. The evaluation team agreed with this recommendation, since most presenters appeared to rush to finish their workshops in the allotted time. This was not the case with the general meetings; the time allotted for them was adequate. The program director stated that the sessions had to be limited to three and one-half hours because the budget allocation was sufficient to pay the 430 teachers only for half-day sessions. A second option, eliminating half the applicants

and offering full-day sessions, was rejected. A number of participants also felt that supervisors and principals should be offered training sessions -- an idea considered excellent by the evaluators if such training were offered separately for teachers to avoid any possible use of the sessions as forums for intergroup conflicts.

In general, respondents perceived handouts, visual aids, and other materials used in the workshops as strengthening the presentations. They also considered most speakers skillful at making clear, well-organized, and stimulating presentations. Several respondents indicated that it was helpful having presenters who were or had been experienced teachers in early childhood education geared toward LEP students.

Furthermore, the majority of respondents stated that the information from the general meetings was new to them and served as a foundation for their work in the subsequent workshops. The few negative comments concerned lack of time for questions and answers. The evaluation team's observations support the participants' views of the speakers.

In summary, the results indicate that participants were highly satisfied with the presentations and workshops offered in the Staff Development Training Program. Further, satisfaction ratings were somewhat related to self-ratings of Spanish and English proficiency. To a lesser extent, educational background may also have contributed to participants' assessment of the program. Overall, since most

background variables explored were not statistically significant, it is safest to conclude that the participants were highly satisfied with the program mostly because of the high quality of the workshops offered.

With regard to achievement, only the relationships with early childhood teaching experience, and license or certification in E.S.L. were statistically significant. However, the relationship to teaching experience was not consistent, so that it is not educationally meaningful, and the relationship to E.S.L. license or certification may only indicate that much of what was covered was already learned by E.S.L. teachers in courses required for their certification. Also, only a few of the many background variables that were explored were statistically significant, suggesting that chance may have been responsible. It is expected that about five percent of statistical tests will be significant by chance. Since so many tests were done, the few findings that were "significant" may not be true effects. Only a validation study on a similar program could verify whether these relationships are truly significant. Finally, it should be noted that achievement and satisfaction were unrelated, suggesting that these variables are independent of each other.

On the basis of analyses of the program, the evaluation team offers the following recommendations for consideration in the planning for similar training in the future:

1. A follow-up survey questionnaire should be developed, administered, and analyzed to see whether the training resulted in actual implementation of strategies in the classroom. Such a survey would provide baseline data for planning similar future activities. This may be accomplished through a one-day follow-up session for all participants to discuss their progress in implementing the strategies gained from the training.

2. The Office of Bilingual Education should continue to assess the needs of bilingual, E.S.L., and specialized content area (e.g., science) teachers as well as administrators and counselors who work with L.E.P. children. O.B.E. should continue to offer staff development of this nature on different issues and at different grade levels. This would replicate the findings of the present study regarding the relationship among background characteristics, satisfaction, and achievement with a different group of teachers.

3. Program staff should tighten the screening process to make sure that districts send only participants who meet the criterion of no more than four years of experience.

4. Program staff should study the ways to lengthen future workshop sessions or provide another forum so there can be greater interaction between presenters and participants.

5. Since the development of a criterion-referenced

instrument based on the objectives of the workshop may not be feasible, the project should eliminate the proposed achievement objective.